

Remarks

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 16, 30, and 33-36 were on appeal as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Watts et al. (6,200,602). The Decision on Appeal dated February 28, 2007 reversed such obviousness rejection with respect to Claims 1-5, 7, 30, and 34-36. Accordingly, Claims 1-5, 7, 30, and 34-36 are in condition for allowance.

The Decision on Appeal objected to Claims 5, 16, 30, and 33 under 37 CFR §1.75(c) for improper multiple dependencies. The claims have been amended to address the multiple dependency issues identified in the Decision on Appeal. Accordingly, the claim objections under 37 CFR §1.75(c) should be withdrawn.

The Decision on Appeal further enters a new ground of rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Watts et al. '602. Specifically, independent Claim 8, and Claims 9, 16, and 33 dependent therefrom, were cited by the Board as being rejected. Solely to expedite allowance of this application, independent Claim 8 has been cancelled, and dependent Claims 9, 16, and 33 have been amended to depend from allowed Claim 1. As such, the claim rejections of Claims 9, 16, and 33 should be withdrawn.

In view of the Decision on Appeal, as well as the present amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 16, 30, and 33-36 are allowable on the merits. A prompt notification to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

HAUGEN LAW FIRM PLLP



Mark J. Burns, Reg. #46591
Attorney for Applicant
1130 TCF Tower
121 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: (612) 339-8300